

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 3 are amended. Independent Claim 1 is amended to recite the additional feature that a memory card drive body is provided with a shape capable of being inserted into a memory card drive slot of a personal computer. Independent Claim 3 is also amended to recite an additional feature substantially similar to the above-noted feature of Claim 1. Support for such additional feature in Claims 1 and 3 is found in the present specification at page 10, lines 6-20, page 13, the last line to page 14, line 12, and Fig. 3, for example. Applicants submit that no new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Grewe et al. (U.S. Patent No. Des. 374,236, herein “Grewe”) in view of Jeong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,276, herein “Jeong”). Claims 7-9, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Grewe in view of Jeong, and further in view of Wallace et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,328, herein “Wallace”).

Addressing the rejection of Claim 1 based on Grewe and Jeong, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a memory card drive and amended to include the above-noted feature that *the memory card drive body is provided with a shape capable of being inserted into a memory card drive slot of a personal computer*. In this regard, nowhere do the cited references of Grewe and Jeong, either taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest that the memory card drive body is provided with a shape capable of being inserted into a memory card drive slot of a personal computer.

Therefore, amended independent Claim 1 and Claim 3 that is amended substantially similarly to amended Claim 1 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited references, either taken individually or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 3 based on the cited references of Grewe and Jeong.

Claims 2 and 4-9 dependent from Claims 1 and 3, respectively, are considered allowable at least for the above reasons advanced for amended independent Claims 1 and 3.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for formal allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edward W. Tracy
Registration No. 47,998

BDL/HY/msh
I:\ATTY\HY\27s\275764\275764 AME RCE.DOC